IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND SIX

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE J.CHELAMESWAR

AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.E.N.PATRUDU

WRIT PETITION No.23078 OF 2005

Between:

The General Superintendent,

PWD Workshop, Sithanagaram,

Guntur District and another.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

Mohan Rao, S/o.C.Monu,

Aged 49 years, Working as

Gr.I Helper, PWD Workshop,

Sithanagaram, Guntur District.

....RESPONDENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE

J.CHELAMESWAR

AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE

M.E.N.PATRUDU

WRIT PETITION No.23078 OF 2005

O R D E R

(Per Sri Justice J.Chelameswar)

Aggrieved by the order in O.A.No.4524 of 2003, dated 14.12.2004 on the file of the A.P. Administrative Tribunal, the unsuccessful respondents therein preferred the present writ petition.

The facts are not in dispute. The respondent was employed in a work-charged establishment of the State of Andhra Pradesh some time in the year 1976 and he continues to work as such till today. Though it may not be very relevant for the present purpose, it is brought to our notice that the Government by issuing G.O.Ms.No.130, dated 18.03.1981 had given an option to the work-charged employees, who have put in ten years of service, to seek absorption into the Government service. Admittedly, the respondent herein did not give such option, but had chosen to continue as an employee of the work-charged establishment. On 16.04.2003 the respondent fell sick. We are informed that the respondent underwent treatment till 22.04.2003 for heart ailment in a private hospital, which is recognised by the State of Andhra Pradesh for the purpose of A.P. Integrated Medical Attendance Rules, 1972 and thereafter the respondent claimed reimbursement of expenditure incurred by him towards the treatment in the above-mentioned hospital. The claim of the respondent was rejected, and therefore, he approached the A.P. Administrative Tribunal by way of the above-mentioned O.A. By the order under challenge, the O.A. was allowed.

The Tribunal rightly held that even under the above-mentioned Rules of 1972 more specifically Rule-6(4)(k), the members of the work-charged establishment are also entitled to free medical attendants.

We do not see any reason to interfere with the well reasoned order of the Tribunal nor is anything brought to our notice to demonstrate that the order under challenge calls for interference. The writ petition is meritless and therefore dismissed at the admission stage itself.

JUSTICE J.CHELAMESWAR

JUSTICE M.E.N.PATRUDU

1st FEBRUARY, 2006

PGS

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE

J.CHELAMESWAR

AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE

M.E.N.PATRUDU

WRIT PETITION No.23078 OF 2005

(Per Sri Justice J.Chelameswar)

1st FEBRUARY, 2006